

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and consideration of the following remarks in response to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance. Upon entry of the amendments of this response, claims 1 – 23 are pending. More specifically, Applicants amend claims 1, 9, 16, and 17. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over of U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 ("*Ertugrul*") in view of Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> ("*Lehman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the method comprising:

providing an email compose interface for composing an email message, the email compose interface configured to designate at least one email recipient, the email compose interface including an email send option for sending the email message to the email recipient, the email compose interface including an IM launch option for launching an IM chat session with the at least one recipient of the email message, ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option;***

receiving an indication to launch an IM chat session with the at least one email recipient of the email message from the email compose interface;

receiving an indication to save an IM chat transcript of the IM chat session; and

saving the IM chat transcript in response to receiving the indication to save the IM chat transcript.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a “method for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the method comprising... providing an email compose interface... **the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option**” as recited in claim 1. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses that “FIG. 2 [of *Ertugrul*] illustrates the body of a representative email message 200 received by an email recipient” (page 3, paragraph [0034]). However, this is different than claim 1, as amended, for at least the reason that an email received by an email recipient cannot be an email compose interface, as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Applicants additionally submit that *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest an “**IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option**” as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses “[b]y sending the e-mail message, the sender pre-registers the recipient (‘Eric Yee’ (212)) for the Instant Messaging service with a generic numbered screen name” (page 3, paragraph [0035]). As illustrated in the excerpt, *Ertugrul* appears to disclose that, prior to receiving the email, the recipient is not registered for the Instant Messaging service. As such, *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest and, in fact, teaches away from “**IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option**” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Lehman fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*. More specifically, *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” (page 1, line 12). As *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” and fails to disclose any email compose interface, *Lehman* is different than claim 1, as

amended. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*.

B. Claim 9 is Allowable Over *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over of U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 ("*Ertugrul*") in view of Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> ("*Lehman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 9. More specifically, claim 9, as amended, recites:

A computer-readable storage medium encoded with instructions for execution, comprising:

computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to provide an email compose interface for composing an email message, the email compose interface configured to designate at least one email recipient, the email compose interface including an email send option for sending the email message to the email recipient, the email compose interface including an IM launch option for launching an IM chat session with the at least one recipient of the email message, ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option;***

computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to receive an indication to launch an IM chat session with the at least one email recipient of the email message from the email compose interface;

computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to receive an indication to save an IM chat transcript of the IM chat session; and

computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to save the IM chat transcript in response to receiving the indication to save the IM chat transcript.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "computer-readable storage medium encoded with instructions for execution, comprising... computer-readable code

adapted to instruct a programmable device to provide an email compose interface... ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***” as recited in claim 9, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses that “FIG. 2 [of *Ertugrul*] illustrates the body of a representative email message 200 received by an email recipient” (page 3, paragraph [0034]). However, this is different than claim 9, as amended, for at least the reason that an email received by an email recipient cannot be an email compose interface, as recited in claim 9, as amended.

Applicants additionally submit that *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest an ***IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***” as recited in claim 9, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses “[b]y sending the e-mail message, the sender pre-registers the recipient (‘Eric Yee’ (212)) for the Instant Messaging service with a generic numbered screen name” (page 3, paragraph [0035]). As illustrated in the excerpt, *Ertugrul* appears to disclose that, prior to receiving the email, the recipient is not registered for the Instant Messaging service. As such, *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest and, in fact, teaches away from ***“IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option”*** as recited in claim 9, as amended.

Lehman fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*. More specifically, *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” (page 1, line 12). As *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” and fails to disclose any email compose interface, *Lehman* is different than claim 9, as amended. Accordingly, claim 9, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*.

C. Claim 16 is Allowable Over *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over of U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 ("*Ertugrul*") in view of Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> ("*Lehman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 16. More specifically, claim 16, as amended, recites:

A system for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the system comprising:

means for providing an email compose interface for composing an email message, the email interface configured to designate at least one email recipient, the email compose interface including an email send option for sending the email message to the email recipient, the email compose interface including an IM launch option for launching an IM chat session with the at least one recipient of the email message, ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option;***

means for receiving an indication to launch an IM chat session with the at least one email recipient of the email message from the email compose interface;

means for receiving an indication to save an IM chat transcript of the IM chat session; and

means for saving the IM chat transcript in response to receiving the indication to save the IM chat transcript.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the system comprising... means for providing an email compose interface... ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***" as recited in claim 16, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses that "FIG. 2 [of

Ertugrul] illustrates the body of a representative email message 200 received by an email recipient" (page 3, paragraph [0034]). However, this is different than claim 16, as amended, for at least the reason that an email received by an email recipient cannot be an email compose interface, as recited in claim 16, as amended.

Applicants additionally submit that *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest an "***IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***" as recited in claim 16, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses "[b]y sending the e-mail message, the sender pre-registers the recipient ('Eric Yee' (212)) for the Instant Messaging service with a generic numbered screen name" (page 3, paragraph [0035]). As illustrated in the excerpt, *Ertugrul* appears to disclose that, prior to receiving the email, the recipient is not registered for the Instant Messaging service. As such, *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest and, in fact, teaches away from "***IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***" as recited in claim 16, as amended.

Lehman fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*. More specifically, *Lehman* discloses "The Essence of Chat" (page 1, line 12). As *Lehman* discloses "The Essence of Chat" and fails to disclose any email compose interface, *Lehman* is different than claim 16, as amended. Accordingly, claim 16, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*.

D. Claim 17 is Allowable Over *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over of U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 ("*Ertugrul*") in view of Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> ("*Lehman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse

this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 17. More specifically, claim 17, as amended, recites:

A system for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the system comprising:

a provide component configured to provide an email compose interface for composing an email message, the email compose interface configured to designate at least one email recipient, the email compose interface including an email send option for sending the email message to the email recipient, the email compose interface including an IM launch option for launching an IM chat session with the at least one recipient of the email message, ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option;***

a first receive component configured to receive an indication to launch an IM chat session with the at least one recipient of the email message from the email compose interface;

a second receive component configured to receive an indication to save an IM chat transcript of the IM chat session; and

a save component configured to save the IM chat transcript in response to receiving the indication to save the IM chat transcript.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a “system for saving a transcript of instant messaging (IM) chat sessions, the system comprising... a provide component configured to provide an email compose interface... ***the email compose interface being configured for a user to input a message in the email compose interface and the IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option***” as recited in claim 17, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses that “FIG. 2 [of *Ertugrul*] illustrates the body of a representative email message 200 received by an email recipient” (page 3, paragraph [0034]). However, this is different than claim 17, as amended, for at least the reason that an email received by an email recipient cannot be an email compose interface, as recited in claim 17, as amended.

Applicants additionally submit that *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest an “***IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of***

the launch IM option” as recited in claim 17, as amended. More specifically, *Ertugrul* discloses “[b]y sending the e-mail message, the sender pre-registers the recipient (‘Eric Yee’ (212)) for the Instant Messaging service with a generic numbered screen name” (page 3, paragraph [0035]). As illustrated in the excerpt, *Ertugrul* appears to disclose that, prior to receiving the email, the recipient is not registered for the Instant Messaging service. As such, *Ertugrul* fails to even suggest and, in fact, teaches away from **“IM option being configured to facilitate automatically launching an IM session in response to selection of the launch IM option”** as recited in claim 17, as amended.

Lehman fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*. More specifically, *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” (page 1, line 12). As *Lehman* discloses “The Essence of Chat” and fails to disclose any email compose interface, *Lehman* is different than claim 17, as amended. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*.

E. Claims 2, 7, 10, 14, 18, and 22 are Allowable Over *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2, 7, 10, 14, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 (“*Ertugrul*”) in view of Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> (“*Lehman*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* in view of *Lehman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2, 7, 10, 14, 18, and 22. More specifically, dependent claims 2 and 7 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. Dependent claims 10 and 14 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 9. Further, dependent claims 18 and 22 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they

depend from allowable independent claim 17. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

F. Claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20 are Allowable Over *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* in view of *Kusuda*

The Office Action indicates that claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 (“*Ertugrul*”) and Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html> (“*Lehman*”) in view of U.S. Publication Number 2003/0088623 (“*Kusuda*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* in view of *Kusuda* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20. More specifically, as explained above, *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* fail to show all the features of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, from which claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20 depend, respectively. *Kusuda* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* with regard to the features set forth in independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Because *Kusuda* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*, claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

G. Claims 6, 13, and 21 are Allowable Over *Ertugrul*, *Lehman* and *Kusuda* in view of *Gusler*

The Office Action indicates that claims 3 – 5, 11 – 12, and 19 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 *Ertugrul et al.* (“*Ertugrul*”), *Lehman* (Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/>, <http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html>), hereinafter (“*Ertugrul*”) and U.S. Publication Number 2003/0088623 (“*Kusuda*”) in view of U.S. Publication Number 2003/0105815 (“*Gusler*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul*, *Lehman* and *Kusuda* in view of *Gusler* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 6, 13, and 21. More specifically, dependent claim 6 is believed to be allowable over *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda* for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 1. Because *Gusler* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda*, claim 6 is allowable as a matter of law. Dependent claim 13 is believed to be allowable over *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda* for at least the reason that it depends from allowable independent claim 9. Because *Gusler* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda*, claim 13 is allowable as a matter of law. Further, dependent claim 21 is believed to be allowable over *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda* for at least the reason that it depends from allowable independent claim 17. Because *Gusler* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul*, *Lehman*, and *Kusuda*, claim 21 is allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

H. Claims 8, 15, and 23 are Allowable Over *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* in view of *Gusler*

The Office Action indicates that claims 8, 15, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0087645 *Ertugrul et al.* ("*Ertugrul*") and *Lehman* (Wayback machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/19970125101157/http://www.albion.com/ngmsn/07chat-sample.html>), hereinafter ("*Ertugrul*") in view of U.S. Publication Number 2003/0105815 *Gusler et al.* ("*Gusler*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Ertugrul* and *Lehman* in view of *Gusler* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 8, 15, and 23. More specifically, *Gusler* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*, with regard to independent claims 1, 9, and 17, from which claims 8, 15, and 23 depend, respectively. Because *Gusler* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Ertugrul* and *Lehman*, claims 8, 15, and 23 are allowable as a matter of law.

In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc., 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

II. Allegedly Inherent Subject Matter

A. The Subject Matter of Claims 6, 13, and 21 is Not Inherent

In addition, in rejecting claims 6, 13, and 21, the Office Action asserts that “converting the IM chat transcript to an email message is inherent by having the ability to provide the transcripts in a variety of different ways” (OA page 11, line 3). Applicants respectfully traverse the finding of inherency. It is well established that “[t]o establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.” *In Re Anthony J. Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to adequately establish that the subject matter of claims 6, 13, and 21 is necessarily present. As the Office Action fails to provide any extrinsic evidence that makes clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present, Applicants respectfully submit that inherency has not been established. In accordance with *In re Robertson*, Applicants traverse the inherency finding, and submit that claims 6, 13, and 21 are allowable over the cited art.

B. The Subject Matter of Claims 8, 15, and 23 is Not Inherent

In addition, in rejecting claims 8, 15, and 23, the Office Action asserts that “saving the IM chat transcript as an email message is inherently a Step prior to sending an email message to a recipient” (OA page 11, line 16). Applicants respectfully traverse the finding of inherency. It is well established that “[t]o establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.” *In Re Anthony J. Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to adequately establish that the subject matter of claims 8, 15, and 23 is necessarily present. As the Office Action fails to provide any extrinsic evidence that makes clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present, Applicants respectfully submit that inherency has not been established. In accordance with *In re Robertson*, Applicants traverse the inherency finding, and submit that claims 8, 15, and 23 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing remarks and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/

Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**